(144)

A TREATISE CONCERNING *Schism* and *Schismaticks*;

Wherein the Chief

Grounds & Principles

Of a Late

SEPARATION

FROM THE

CHURCH of ENGLAND,

ARE

Considered and Answered.

By *Henry Hellier*, D.D. Fellow of *C.C.C. Oxon.*

LONDON,
Printed by *Richard Smith* for *Jo. Crosley* Bookseller
in *Oxford*, MDCXCVII.

A

TREATISE

CONCERNING

Schiſm, &c.

THERE have been many Diſcourſes publiſhed about *Schiſm* ſince the late Revolution, and moſt of them by Men averſe to the preſent Government; who have quoted divers Sentences out of the ancient Fathers, which they ſay, make againſt us; although they will ſerve, according as the caſe is differently ſtated, either of one ſide or the other. They call us who do approve of the preſent Government, Schiſmaticks;

and themſelves the Church of *England*, who have ſeparated themſelves from it; accuſing us of Immoralities in our Prayers; of all the miſchiefs that are done in the Wars; of ſetting up Anti-Biſhops; concluding that we are without the Church, and that there is no Salvation to be had among us in the ordinary way. Wherefore it can be no unſeaſonable work to enquire into the nature of Schiſm impartially, and into the ways whereby Men may become Schiſmaticks, in order to the clearing ſuch as are innocent from this Offence, and to the charging it in the right place, and on the Perſons that are truly guilty of it. And ſeeing our Adverſaries have taken ſo much liberty of Speech againſt us, as after they have called us Schiſmaticks, and ſaid we are in a ſtate of Damnation, to boaſt of and print Catalogues of their Books unanſwered; It is but reaſonable that any Man on our part ſhould be heard alſo, that hath a mind to ſpeak, without being blamed only for writing againſt them, much leſs for indifferent ſtating of the caſe; for they have given

given ſufficient cauſe for both: But this latter is the thing which I principally intend to do; namely, to give a ſtate of the Caſe, or to conſider the rational part of the Subject; which ſeems hitherto to have been moſt neglected, although it is of the greateſt uſe. For if the nature of Schiſm in general, and the ways whereby Men do become Schiſmaticks, are once well underſtood, it will be eaſie to explain the Sentences commonly quoted out of the Fathers, and to make uſe of them if we pleaſe, againſt our Adverſaries; or it will be lawful to reject them, although there will be no need of that; for there are none of them that I know of, which, after a Man hath duly conſidered of the Subject, will ſeem to favour them. Therefore to make a general Diſcourſe on this Subject, and alſo to include particular matters within as ſhort a compaſs as conveniently may be, I ſhall endeavour to ſhew 1. What Schiſm is, and how the Members of the Church may become guilty of it. 2. I ſhall ſpeak ſomething alſo of the ſinfulneſs and inconvenience of it,

to

to the intent that we may avoid it.

1. Let us consider what Schism is, and how the Members of the Church may become guilty of it.

As for the word *Schism*, it signifies properly the cutting or cleaving of a solid Body, from Σχίζω or Σχίζομαι; hence it is translated to denote diversity of Opinions and Professions, in those that once appeared at least to be agreed in them; for they that never were united, cannot be said to be cut asunder. And according to this metaphorical Acceptation, Schism is a breach of Unity in any Society whatsoever: But common use and custom hath applied it only to that which divideth the Unity of the Church.

Yet not the bare Separation, but giving the cause of Separation, makes the Schism. Whereſoever a Schism is, each Party is divided or separated from the other, but each Party is not in a state of Schism; that is, doth not give the cause of Separation, unless it so falls out, as it sometimes may, that both of them are in fault, neither doing its part towards the maintaining of Agreement,

so

ſo far as is neceſſary to the preſervation of Unity, in order to one common end.

Now, as many ways as there are, for the Members of the Church to profeſs themſelves united one with another, with relation to matters concerning them, as they are the Church and Congregation of Chriſtian People: So many there are alſo for one or more Members to become Schiſmatical, by breaking off that Union in outward profeſſion, which is a Duty incumbent on them,

I ſpeak of Union which relates to Matters concerning them, as they are Members of the Church: Whence, not every paſſionate Heat, not every Quarrel, not every Suit of Law, not every War, not every Faction or Sedition among the People doth make a Schiſm.

I ſpeak alſo of Union in outward Profeſſion: For, tho' there is an internal Union and Communion of all God's faithful People, in regard they have the ſame Faith, and the ſame Hope, and do practice the ſame Chriſtian Virtues; and in default of theſe, or any one of theſe, a Man in ſome

ſort

ſort cuts himſelf off from thoſe faithful People, and from the Portion which doth belong to them, and ſo the ſecret Infidel, and the ſecret Sinner, may be ſaid to be ſeparated now; for they are none of Chriſt's, and ſhall hear that Sentence in the ſeparation of good and bad Men hereafter, *Depart from me, for I know you not:* Yet this is a matter not peculiarly belonging to Schiſm, but common to it with every other Sin, and therefore, in that Senſe I ſhall not now conſider it, but only as it is a Breach of external Communion, and Separation as to outward Profeſſion; although this may be committed as well as any other Sin in the Mind alſo, by a Man's intending or purpoſing to leave the outward Communion of the Church, when perhaps he hath not as yet actually done it.

Now, as the outward Unity or Communion of every Society appears in the apt Order of the Members one with another, and Demeanour one towards another, according to their reſpective States and Conditions, as in one Houſe, one City,

ty, one Kingdom: So does the Unity of the Church consist in Mens acting according to their just Relations, as Members of the Church, in keeping fair Correspondence, and retaining a due Agreement in Doctrine of Faith and Morals, and in Discipline; that is to say, Church-Government, and the things that belong to it, as being requisit to the due Administration and right Management of it.

And this Unity is consistent with several things, seemingly dividing Persons as Members of the Church, and that partly even in the aforesaid respects; with diversity of Spiritual Gifts and Functions; with diversity of Opinions, as to Matters of Religion; with Ecclesiastical Disputes and Contentions; with various Judgments and Resolutions, as to particular Circumstances and Cases relating to Moral Actions; with Canons and Constitutions of divers kinds; with difference in Ceremonies, or other parts of Discipline in divers Countries, or divers Parts of the same Country, according to the several Exigencies of Affairs, and according to the Discretion or

Approbation of the Governors Civil or Eccleſiaſtical, as it doth concern them. All theſe things may be, and yet the Church continue ſtill the ſame, as *the Queen in a Veſture of Gold wrought about with divers Colours.*

Yea, Church-Cenſures may go on, and Perſons be Excommunicated; and yet, unleſs they wilfully continue under Excommunication, no Schiſm be made; becauſe they do not cut themſelves off from the Church, but are cut off by others; and therefore are not as Schiſmaticks, Αὐτοκατάκριτοι, *Condemned of themſelves*, as the Apoſtle ſpeaketh. Tit. 3. 11.

Schiſm therefore is a wilfull breaking off of that outward Unity, which one or more Members ought to maintain with the reſt. A Schiſmatick or Schiſmaticks are, that one, or thoſe many Perſons, who do publickly refuſe to act according to his or their juſt Relations, as Members of the Church, in the ſtation wherein they are placed. Or, to ſpeak more briefly, a Schiſmatick is that Member of the Church, which diſowns and cuts it ſelf off from the

the reſt; either contemning and rejecting the other Members, as *if the Eye ſhall ſay to the Hand, I have no need of thee*; or again, *The Head to the Feet, I have no need of you*: Or elſe encroaching and breaking in upon the Rights of other Members, as if the *Foot ſhall ſay, becauſe I am not the Hand*, or *not the Head, I am not of the Body*, and will not be of the Body: Or Laſtly, refuſing to communicate its Office to the reſt, not *diſtributing to the Neceſſities of the Saints*, not ſuffering and rejoycing with the other Members, the Members not *having the ſame Care* according to their different places and capacities *one for another*, according to the Expreſſion of the Apoſtle.

1 Cor. 12. 21.

V. 15, 16.

1 Cor. 12. 25.

To know therefore who is a Schiſmatick, and who not, it will be neceſſary to conſider, in ſome general Terms at leaſt, the Relations wherein Men may be, and the ſeveral Cauſes or Pretences of ſeparating, with regard to ſuch Relations, declaring withal, ſo far as in a ſhort Diſcourſe of this Nature conveniently may be, which are unlawful, and which are good and ſufficient.

And Firſt, As there is an Unity in general, which ought to be maintained by all Chriſtian Churches throughout the World, they being all reconciled to God in *One Body*, and *Baptized into One Body*, and *made to drink into One Spirit*, and being called *One Body*, whereof our Lord is the *Head, from whom the whole Body fitly joyned together, and compacted by that which every Joynt ſupplyeth, according to the effectual working in the meaſure of every part, maketh encreaſe of the Body, unto the edifying of it ſelf in love.* So there may be a Breach made of this Unity by any particular Church, and thereby whole Churches may become Schiſmatical. Whole Churches in reſpect of the whole Body of Chriſtians, have ſuch Relation, as ſingle Members have, with Regard to any particular Church: They therefore, as well as ſingle Members of particular Churches, may fall into Schiſm, when either in expreſs Terms, or by neceſſary conſequence, they break off their Communion and Friendly Correſpondence with the reſt; which may be done ſeveral ways, 1. By profeſſing a different

Eph. 2. 16. 1 Cor. 12. 13.

1 Cor. 10. 17. 1 Cor. 12. 27. Eph. 4. 15, 16.

rent Faith: Or, 2. Different *Agenda* or Morals. 3. By different Church-Government; either as to the *Species* or kind of Government, or as to the manner of exerciſing of it.

1. They may become guilty of Schiſm, by profeſſing a different Faith, or appointing different Creeds in any Material Point from other Churches: For Chriſtian Communion doth not require, but forbid us to have Fellowſhip with thoſe who do not hold the Truth, as to the Subſtantials of Chriſtian Religion. The Body of Chriſt hath but *One Faith*; and conſidering that the main Points of Faith have ſuch Influence upon our Lives and Actions, and are of ſo high importance to every one of us, we ought to *Contend earneſtly for the Faith which was once delivered to the Saints*, and to *withdraw* our *ſelves* from thoſe who *teach otherwiſe, and conſent not to wholeſome words, even the words of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and to the Doctrine which is according to Godlineſs.* Not but that Chriſtians may differ, and diſpute, and err about Matters of leſs Moment, or ways of explaining

Jud. 3.

1 Tim. 6. 5.

1 Tim. 6. 3.

plaining the True Faith not ſo clearly delivered, without either actually ſeparating themſelves from the Church, or deſerving to be cut off from it, except they do oblige Men to concur with them, and to profeſs a Belief of their Errors: For then we may, and ought to depart from them; it being not lawful for any one, to profeſs he believes that to be true, which at the ſame time he takes to be an Error, even in a matter of the ſmalleſt moment.

2. They may become guilty of Schiſm, by making wrong Profeſſions *de Agendis*, or concerning Morals: For none ought to concur with any Man, or any number of Men, in that which is immoral. Concord is only commendable in that which is good, not in that which is evil. To profeſs an Immorality, is not only to do an immoral thing, (the profeſſion of it being a ſinful Act) but it is worſe than doing the ſame immoral thing that is agreeable to ſuch Profeſſion: It is a ſin committed with deliberation, greater than commonly precedes the Act of Sin; it makes us perſevere and continue in ſin;

it

it tends to the ſeducing and deſtroying others in a more eminent degree than the Act. If any Man therefore ſhall teach Doctrines manifeſtly contradictory to any part of the Moral Law; if a Man ſays, inſtead of, *Honour thy Father and Mother*, *Thou ſhalt not honour thy Father or thy Mother*: Inſtead of, *Let every ſoul be ſubject to the Higher Powers*; *Let ſome men not be ſubject to the Higher Powers*, and maintains this Doctrine in Oppoſition to the Members of his own or other Churches, he is a Schiſmatick. But he that allows of thoſe Precepts, and knows not who is his King, or who is his Father, is miſtaken in the Perſon, not in the Commandment; or at moſt, he is only miſtaken about the Laws of the Land, which (tho' they do oblige in Conſcience when known, yet) it is not every Man's buſineſs, nor doth lye in every Man's power perfectly to underſtand: And an Error in theſe, does not always imply a miſunderſtanding the Commandments of God. He that errs in Explication of ſome Moral Points; as, in ſhewing, How a Man muſt honour his King

King or his Father, or in ſetting the Bounds and Meaſures of Obedience to them; or in ſuch a matter as I am now about, in ſtating the Caſe of Schiſm, is not preſently to be eſteemed guilty of Schiſm: For a Miſtake, though profeſſed in Matters leſs principal, either of Faith or Morals, unleſs it makes void the general Commandment, or ſome plain Article of Faith, will not make a Man a Schiſmatick. If it did, conſidering how little ſome do underſtand how to explain the Articles of their Faith, how apt thoſe that have a competent underſtanding of them; are to differ in their manner of explaining them, how various Mens Notions are about ſeveral Points of Caſuiſtical Divinity, and Commentaries on Morals contained in the Commandments; and how difficult it is to ſuppoſe, that Men will be agreed in every Circumſtance of them, the Church would always abound with Schiſmaticks, and there would be no remedy for it: Such things therefore are to be born with in all Communions, as being unavoidable in this Life, where we are ſubject to Errors, and our Knowledge

is only *in part*; unleſs the Doctrines be of very ill and dangerous conſequence, obſtinately taught, and earneſtly preſs'd upon us, and our Concurrence required in them, as a Condition of Communion.

But what ſhall be interpreted Concurrence? He that hears a Man preach falſe Doctrine in the Church, or read an Homily, wherein ſomething is ſaid againſt his Opinion; or he that hears ſomething in the Common-Prayers, or in the Pulpit-prayer before Sermon, which by reaſon of ſome Circumſtances he does diſlike, cannot be ſaid to concur in all Doctrines ſo taught, or in all Prayers ſo put up: And therefore, it is not a ſufficient Cauſe to make a ſeparate Congregation, that we diſlike the Title given to the King, or any other Perſon there mentioned; nor are theſe immoral things in their own nature, but on the account of Circumſtances of Mens doing them againſt their Conſciences, *&c.* And indeed, I do thus far agree with our new Separatiſts, That whoſoever thinks the King to be an Unjuſt Poſſeſſor, and to keep the Rightful One out of the

Throne, ought not to be so much as present at our Publick Fasts, Thanksgivings, &c. whilst he continues under that Error, because no Man ought to act against his Conscience: But even such an one hath not sufficient reason to forsake our Communion altogether, unless he be forced to give consent to something that he thinks unlawful, offered up in the Publick Prayers, which a Man's bare presence doth not always imply: For then almost all those things that I excluded in the beginning of this Discourse, would produce a Schism. We shall not have a Dispute about a Prince's Title, a Civil War, or War with a Foreign Nation, or so much as a Suit of Law, or Quarrel with our Neighbour, or a Design thwarting his in the common Transactions of Human Life; but there will follow also among us different Apprehensions and Opinions concerning the justice or injustice of them; and consequently, concerning certain passages in our Publick Prayers which relate to them; and thereupon we may think it unlawful to say some words, or at least to take

take them in the ſame ſenſe that others commonly do, and ſo make a Schiſm: And when there is a Diviſion of the Church, whereby New Paſtors and Governors are introduced, and lay claim to the ſame Dioceſes or Pariſhes, how ſhall it be reconciled, although the Differences that occaſioned it ſhould be brought to an end? How many would our Diviſions be, if all the Factions that ever were in the State, ſhould have made a Schiſm in the Church alſo? But theſe indeed are Matters which are not ſimply immoral in their own nature, but only by reaſon of Circumſtances relating to particular Perſons; neither do they tend to the Overthrow of the Churches Faith or Morals; nor are they of long continuance; but as particular Perſons or their circumſtances alter, ceaſe of themſelves. And therefore ſuch Prayers, if not very many and frequent, ought to be tolerated, even by thoſe by whom they may not be ſaid, to avoid a greater Evil, *viz.* The Deſtruction of the Church, and laſting Depravation of Piety and good Morals, the natu-

ral conſequences of Separations made from the Church upon the account of them.

Much leſs may we ſeparate our ſelves from all thoſe who are any way guilty of immoral Actions, as ſome * Schiſmaticks pretended to do of old: But I think we have had none ſuch among us of late, unleſs they may be eſteemed of this Number, who hold themſelves obliged to ſeparate from us, only † becauſe we have taken Oaths which they account unlawful. A Separation from all bad Men, is not only unreaſonable, but in this Life, impoſſible. Hence the Church of Chriſt is compared in H. Scripture to a *Floor*, on which is *Wheat* and *Chaff*; to a *Net*, which receives *Fiſhes good* and *bad*; to a *Marriage Feaſt*, to which *many are called*, but *few* of them *are choſen*; to a *Fold*, having in it both *Sheep* and *Goats*; to a *Great Houſe*, wherein *are not only Veſſels of Gold and of Silver, but alſo of Wood and of Earth; and ſome to Honour, and ſome to Diſhonour*: Wherefore we may not pretend to ſeparate our ſelves from all thoſe that do immoral things; for then, as the Apoſtle ſays, *We*

muſt

* The *Novatians, Donatiſts*, &c.

† See the Unreaſonableneſs of the new Separation, p. 1.

Mat. 3. 12. Luc. 3. 17. Mat. 13, 47, 48 Mat. 22. 14. Mat. 25. 32, 33 2 Tim. 2. 20.

muſt needs go out of the world. Nor if Men do ſuch things, muſt they thereupon be accounted Schiſmaticks, or to have departed from the outward Communion of the Church? But if they make them Terms of Communion, or perſiſt ſo long in them, as to give a juſt occaſion of Church-Cenſures upon them, and wilfully remain under thoſe Cenſures. 1 Cor. 5. 10.

Laſtly, by *Agenda*, or Morals, I would not be underſtood to mean that only which is obligatory in its own nature, but that alſo which obligeth on the account of Divine Inſtitution, as the Sacraments; by diminiſhing from which, or adding to them, Men break the Unity of the Church of God, and make it unlawful for others to joyn with them. They treſpaſs indeed againſt Faith and Morals alſo, taking away from Men the Seals of God's Covenant, the Tokens of his Favour, the Pawns and Pledges of the Performance of his Promiſes, appointed by himſelf for the quickening of our Faith, and ſacrilegiouſly robbing God of the principal and moſt memorable Part of his Worſhip, whereby we declare

clare in moſt Solemn Manner, a Belief of his Promiſes, and vow Obedience to his Commands, whereby we put on the Badges and diſtinguiſhing Marks of our Chriſtian Calling. Theſe are therefore the ſtricteſt and higheſt Bands of Union, from which St. *Paul* in divers places infers the Unity of the Church: *We being many, are one Body and one Bread; for we are all partakers of that one Bread*, 1 Cor. 10. 17. And again, *By one Spirit we are all baptized into one Body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be Bond or Free, and have all been made to drink into one Spirit*, 1 Cor. 12. 13.

And both theſe kinds of Schiſm; namely, ſuch as are conſtituted by profeſſing Errors in Faith or Morals, do imply Hereſie alſo, and may be called by either Name, according to our different Conſideration of them; as they do imply falſe Doctrine in Matters neceſſary to Salvation, obſtinately perſiſted in, Hereſie; as they are accompanyed with Separation from the Church, or do give a juſt Cauſe of Separation, Schiſm. *Hereſie* and *Schiſm* are ſeldom long

long aſunder. There are few Hereticks but will endeavour by ſeparate Congregations to propagate their Hereſie; or Schiſmaticks, but will frame to themſelves ſome New Doctrine, the better to juſtifie their Separation from the Church, as *St. *Jerom* obſerved. The Apoſtle ſeems to uſe both theſe Words in the ſame Senſe, 1 *Cor.* 11. 18, 19. *I hear that there be Diviſions* (the Word is Σχίσματα,) *among you; and I partly believe it, for there muſt be alſo Hereſies among you*, &c, And certainly every Heretick, openly profeſſing and maintaining his Hereſie, whether he is able to get a ſeparate Congregation or not, may be called a Schiſmatick; and a Schiſmatick perſiſting in his Schiſm, will be very apt to fall into Hereſie, according to the forecited Paſſage of St. *Jerom*. * On *Tit.* 3.

3. Whole Churches, as well as ſingle Perſons, may incur the Guilt of Schiſm, by their differences about Church-Government; ſometimes as to the *Species* or kind of Government, and ſometimes as to the manner of exerciſing it.

Sometimes by a different *Species* or kind of

of Government: As for Inſtance; When they do recede from Epiſcopacy, and break wilfully the Line of Apoſtolical Succeſſion: For in ſo doing, they cauſe probably great Diſorders within themſelves, and in other Churches alſo, by looſing the Bands of Union among themſelves, and hindering good Correſpondence with other Churches, by taking away the chief Pillars and Supporters of that Correſpondence, and tacitly diſappearing their ſort of Government, tempting ſome of them to diſlike it, and to endeavour a Change for that which is likely to prove much worſe inſtead of it, as on many other accounts ſo particularly, becauſe it hath not the Examples of the beſt and pureſt Ages to maintain it. But tho' Churches may ſometimes be Schiſmatical on this account, yet they are not always ſo in this Caſe: For there may be a juſt Cauſe of breaking off that outward Succeſſion, where the Profeſſion of the true Chriſtian Faith, and of good Morals, muſt be otherwiſe utterly wanting; the preſervation of which, is declared in the Holy Scriptures neceſſary to Salvation, not the man-

manner of Government ſo declared; conſequently, this cannot be equally neceſſary to all People. This, in caſe of a general Corruption, or ſometimes on the Account of the Members of the Church being diſperſed abroad, perhaps cannot be had: And muſt Men continue in ſuch Corruption, for fear of breaking off Succeſſion? Or fall into a ſtate of Damnation, for not being able to preſerve it? What Uncertainties will ſome Mens Doctrine make all the Advantages we can receive from Chriſtianity, and finally our Salvation to depend upon? Sometimes on the Goodneſs of a a King's, ſometimes of a Biſhop's Title, and ſometimes on the Regularity of Succeſſion. How unreaſonably are Men condemned, whom God hath not condemned, and declared to be in the ſtate of thoſe that never heard of Chriſt, even although they do perform all the Goſpel Conditions? Only becauſe they have not among them a certain Order, which is not abſolutely neceſſary to the Being, * but only to the well-being, not neceſſary abſolutely

* — What hath periſhed of the Outward Form or Body of Government, being loſt without any fault or guilt of theirs, (their Infelicity, which they could not prevent, and not their Crime voluntarily brought upon themſelves:) This ſure will never be look'd on by God as any dangerous want of Order, or as that which ſhall be any way chargeable upon them. Order is required to the Well-being, not neceſſary abſolutely to the Being of a Church; an orderleſs, or a ſecret Society of Brethren, may be a Church ſtill, as any number of Converts in a City, before the Apoſtle, which was gone to ſome other City, had yet placed any Governour over them. Dr. *Hammond*'s *Second Defence of the Treatiſe of Schiſm*, Ch. 6. S. 11.

ly to the Well-being of the Church. It is no where commanded, although it seems indeed to be approved of by our blessed Saviour in the *Apocalypse* ‖, and is plainly enough made out to have been instituted by the Apostles, and hath been found by Experience a very strong Band of Union, in respect of the Universal Church, and particular ones too, where it hath had its just Authority: Not but that the Succession in some places hath failed, or been interrupted, (I do not except the Church of *Rome* it self, which doth boast so much of it) and may fail again; or we may depart from it when it cannot consist with Succession of true Faith and good Morals, without an utter and irrecoverable loss of the Advantages of the Christian Religion, the Church of Christ, or the ordinary hopes of Salvation. And although no Man ought to assume to himself a Power of Governing the Church of God, but stay till it is regularly conferr'd upon him; yet, where there is a general Deficiency and Apostacy from the Profession of the true Faith and sound Morals, and they who are to confer this Right,

‖ *Rev. Ch.* 2.

Right, are themſelves corrupted alſo, and will not give this Power to any that are willing to reform it; in ſuch extraordinary caſes of general Apoſtacy, (which, how far it may poſſibly reach, I will not here diſpute) Perſons, Prieſts at leaſt, who have Gifts and Abilities for it, have a ſufficient *Call* to interpoſe themſelves, and are not to be blamed, but highly commended for making uſe of it.

Sometimes again, there may be a Schiſm made by the ill Exerciſe of Church-Government; by a Churches refuſing to hold Communion with the reſt, or unjuſtly cenſuring and excommunicating them, or diſobeying General Councils, the Repreſentatives of the whole Church, in matters which they have a lawful Power to determine; by uſurping too great Authority over the reſt; by aſſuming the Name of Catholick to it ſelf, in oppoſition to all other Churches; by making ſuch unreaſonable Terms of Communion, as that others ſhall not be able to communicate with it; by encouraging and upholding Perſons excommunicated, or deſervedly declared Schiſ-

maticks by other Churches; by wilfully continuing in Faults, and under juſt Excommunication incurred thereupon; by refuſing to keep friendly Correſpondence with other Churches, as in Communicatory Letters, (which are in order to the well governing of the Church) and the like.

And it is about the Exerciſe of Church-Government, that Schiſm is generally converſant: All Schiſms of particular Members of the Church, conſidered as diſtinct from Hereſies, are about Church-Government; and commonly about the Exerciſe of it, being occaſioned either, 1. By Superiors contending for Power; or, 2. Miſemploying their Power; or, 3. By Inferiors Diſobedience to the Power.

1. By Superiors, Civil or Eccleſiaſtical, contending for Power: The Civil Governors uſurping that which belongs to the Eccleſiaſtical, or the Eccleſiaſtical that which belongs to the Civil, or the Eccleſiaſtical Governors contending with one another; For the Contention of Civil Governors, conſidered only as ſuch, *i. e.* about their own Rights and Titles, will not conſtitute a Schiſm,

Schiſm, nor give a juſt occaſion for a Separation; although ſome have lately, as it ſeems, taken occaſion to make a Schiſm on the account thereof, whoſe Principles are partly conſidered in that which went before, and will be farther in that which follows, according as they ſhall be found under their proper Heads.

I. It may be committed by Civil Governors, invading the Power and Authority of the Eccleſiaſtical: For although it be true, that every one of the Clergy is ſubject to the Civil Governors; I mean, to that one or more Perſons in whom the Supreme Power is lodged: Yet there are ſome parts of their Office, which no King or Prince can aſſume to himſelf; as, The Power of the Keys, the Power of Ordination, of adminiſtring the Sacraments, of officiating as Prieſts in the Publick Worſhip of God, and other ſuch like; which if they undertake without being lawfully called thereunto of God, they are guilty (among other ſins) of the ſin of Schiſm; and we may ſay unto them, as the Prieſts did to *Uzziah*,

Uzziah, when he went to burn Incense upon the Altar; *It appertaineth not unto thee*, Uzziah, *to burn Incense unto the Lord, but to the Priests the Sons of* Aaron, *that are consecrated to burn incense*, 2 Cor. 26. 18.

II. There is a Schism made when Ecclesiastical Governors deny the Authority of the Supreme Civil Powers; for they have the care of the Church also, being *Custodes utriusq; Tabulæ*, and appointed to be *nursing Fathers* of the Church. Our Obligation to every Human Law is derived from the Divine; and seeing Religion is the support of all Government, and the foundation of all Justice * and Peace, it cannot but belong to their care. They therefore that shall deny them that Power, which is annexed to their Imperial Dignity; To reform Abuses in the Worship of God, and in the Clergy; to constitute Bishops and Pastors; on occasion, to depose or deprive them; to call together and to preside in Councils; to dispense with their Canons, to rescind or alter them as they see a just occasion: All which

* Quod in Religionem Divinam committitur in omnium fertur injuriam, *l.* 4. *C. de Hæreticis.*

which things Chriſtian Kings have done, and that upon good grounds. If theſe are indeed the Powers of the Sovereign, as it may be proved † they are, then, they who deny them theſe Powers, and aſſume the ſame to themſelves, are Schiſmaticks: Such are therefore the Papiſts, who by virtue of their *Ordination*, pretend to be gotten out of the power of Princes, and independent on them; yea, to be above them, and to govern them *in temporalibus in ordine ad ſpirituale bonum*, ‖ by which Claim they ſhew the unreaſonableneſs of all the reſt, in effect confeſſing that to the right management of the Spiritual, there is a neceſſity of an over-ruling Temporal Power, which they would therefore get unto themſelves.

† You may ſee all this very well proved in *Grotius, de imperio Summarum Poteſtatum circa Sacra.* And good part of it is owned by the Author of *Chriſtian Communion*, p. 26, 27. 29. and elſewhere.

‖ *Bellarminus de Rom. Pont.* lib. 5. cap. 6. *Papa poteſt mutare regna, & uni auferre, atq; alteri conferre, tanquam ſummus Princeps ſpiritualis, ſi id neceſſarium ſit ad animarum ſalutem.* Ibid.

III. Eccleſiaſtical Governors become Schiſmaticks, by contending for Power among themſelves: As for Example; When one Biſhop lays claim to the Dioceſe of another,

another, ſetting up himſelf, or ſuffering others to ſet him up an Anti-Biſhop, *erecting Altar againſt Altar*, according to the ancient Phraſe. And in ſome Elections indeed it hath been difficult to know who was the Anti Biſhop; and the Emperor upon ſuch an occaſion, hath cauſed † both of the Contenders to depart out of the City; yea, after having called a Synod *, he hath depoſed at one time three, that have pretended a Right to the Papacy, and created a fourth inſtead of them, to preſerve the Peace of the Church. But there is not always the ſame difficulty to know who is the true Biſhop: As for inſtance;

If a Biſhop reſigns or gives up his Dioceſe, and after the vacancy thereof another be put in his room, he cannot afterwards come back and lay claim to a Dioceſe ſo given up, any more than to one that he never preſided over at all: And therefore, in that caſe it is plain enough, that he is the Schiſmatick,

† The Caſe of *Bonifacius* and *Eulalius*, Baron. Ann. 419. §. 15.

* *Henricus Secundus in Italiam cum magno exercitu veniens, habitâ Synodo, cum Benedictum nonum, Sylveſtrum tertium Gregorium ſextum tanquam tria teterrima monſtra abdicare ſe magiſtratu coegiſſet, Syndegerum Bambergenſem Epiſcopum, cui Clementi ſecundo appellatio fuit Pontificem creat.* Platina de vitis Pontif. 155. Pont.

Clemens Secundus, Syndegerus antea vocatus, Bambergenſis Epiſcopus in Synodo Pontifex creatur, annuente Henrico Secundo vel imperante, & cogente potius. Idem 156. Pont.

tick, or the Anti-Biſhop, that comes to put in any ſuch claim.

And a Biſhop is under the ſame Circumſtances, who is put out of his Dioceſe by ſufficient Authority, and is under the ſame guilt of Schiſm, if he comes to make a ſecond claim to the ſame Dioceſe. For it is very clear, that if he be deprived by a ſufficient Power, he is in the ſame condition, as if he never had been ~~their~~ his Biſhop. Such an one therefore, who has been ſo deprived, if he ſhall return and ſay to the People; I am your true Paſtor ſtill; you ought to obey, not this Man that hath ſucceeded, but me; He is juſtly to be eſteemed a Schiſmatick, and ſo are conſequently all they that do defend him, and adhere to him.

I know there have been two things urged, and are chiefly inſiſted upon, in defenſe of a Separation of this nature; 1. * That Biſhops, though deprived of Temporalities, are not diveſted of their Spiritual Power; that it is their Duty, expreſs'd by their Titles of *Watchmen*, *Meſſengers*, *Shepherds*,

* This is the Summ of what is objected in the firſt Part of *Chriſtian Communion*.

herds, &c. in holy Scripture to make use of that their Power, in order to the Extirpation of Immoralities; which according to the Opinion of those who hold the present King to be only King *de facto*, and the other to be King *de jure* (whom they suppose to be the major part) must necessarily, as they say, follow, by praying for the King *de facto*, the unjust Possessor, as they understand it, against the King *de jure*, the rightful King, in the publick Prayers, especially on the more solemn days of Fasting, Thanksgiving, &c.

2. They (having * professedly waved the Question about the King's Title) do urge, that the Deprivation of Temporalities merely by a ‖ Lay-power is invalid. † Therefore the old Bishops retain still their Right, the others are Anti-Bishops and Schismaticks that are set up against them.

* *Christian Communion*, pag. 8.

‖ This objected in the Second Part.

† This is inferred from the former Principles in the Third Part.

As to the First of these Objections, I answer, 1. That the Author who makes it, seems to have misunderstood the Treatise called *The Unreasonableness of a new Separation*

tion on the account of the Oaths, &c. which he quotes in divers places and deſervedly commends. Wherefore I ſhall repeat ſomething out of it. *An Uſurper is one, who comes in by Force, and continues by Force. A King* de jure *is one, who comes in by lineal Deſcent, as next Heir, and whoſe Right is owned and Recognized by the Eſtates of the Realm. A King* de facto *is one, who comes in by conſent of the Nation, but not by virtue of an* immediate Hereditary Right; *but to ſuch a one being owned and received by the Eſtates of the Realm, the Law of* England, *as far as I can ſee, requires an Allegiance.*

The Unreaſonableneſs of a new Separation, &c. pag. 30.

So then a King *de facto* doth not ſignifie an unjuſt Poſſeſſor, for he is King *jure optimo*; By ſuch a Right as ſuperſedes the bare right of Inheritance not recognized by the Eſtates of the Realm; By ſuch a Right as all the Laws which make our Allegiance due to a King *de facto* do confirm, by ſuch a Right as implies ſometimes, and particularly in the preſent Caſe, an expreſs and free Conſent of the People by their Repreſentatives, which is better than a tacit

cit Conſent implied in Preſcription, (which in theſe days is the only thing that can make Succeſſion a good Title, conſidered as diſtinct from other Titles) or a forced Conſent, *i. e.* Conſent ſubſequent upon Conqueſt, which only doth make Conqueſt a good Title.

2. As for any other meaning of *a King de facto*, I ſhall not concern my ſelf with it, but only take notice, that, whether Men call the preſent King, King *de facto*, or *de jure*, if they hold him to be their Sovereign to whom Allegiance is due (which can never be due from the ſame Perſon to two oppoſite Kings at once,) the Prayers for his Preſervation, Victory over his Enemies, *&c.* do not contain any Immoralities but only that which is their bounden Duty, and that which is implyed if we ſhould uſe no other than the Apoſtles own words, Praying, *For Kings, and for all that are in Authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable Life in all Godlineſs and Honeſty.* Nor is then the uſing, but the omiſſion of ſuch Prayers on days by their Superiors appointed for ſolemn Meet-

1 Tim. 2. 2.

ings

ings rather to be eſteemed an Immorality.

3. But if Men ſhould uſe thoſe Prayers againſt their Conſciences, and profeſs they did ſo, (which it is to be hoped few or none do) or if they ſhould be guilty of other open and acknowledg'd Immoralities, muſt He that is not Biſhop of the Dioceſe come thither to reform them? Then for the Extirpation of Immoralities, which are to be found more or leſs in every Dioceſe, any Biſhop might invade the Dioceſe of another, ſaying he came to take away Immoralities, to teach Men their duty, *&c.* And though the Commiſſion of the Apoſtles, when *the Labourers* were few, was indefinite over all the World, and that of Biſhops and Paſtors is ſo in ſome ſort now, in regard they are according to their Places and Stations to give aſſiſtance to and promote the Edification of the whole Church of Chriſt, and are in that ſenſe Biſhops over all the Church; yet they are to be under certain Orders and Rules and within bounds, ſuch as may be conſiſtent with the good Government and Peace of the Church; and there-

fore not to make their Dioceſes as large as they pleaſe, or go [a] diſorderly beyond their own Precincts or proper Diſtricts. Whence it was juſtly forbidden (if not by expreſs [b] Scripture, as ſome think yet) by the Canons called [c] Apoſtolical, by the two firſt General [d] Councils, by the Council of *Antioch* [e], and by the Imperial Laws [f], that one Biſhop ſhould [g] *Invade* the Dioceſe of another; whereby is underſtood doing the Epiſcopal Offices therein without [h] conſent of the Biſhop of the Place; when he is not [i] gone off, or deprived; without being appointed [k] by other Biſhops ſo to do; not being in [l] Barbarous Nations where Biſhops and Paſtors are wanting. Without ſome of which Reaſons ſpecified and excepted by the Councils prohibiting them, no Man therefore ought to return back to officiate in a Dioceſe of which he is deprived, notwithſtanding any pretence of Immoralities.

Fourthly and Laſtly, Schiſm is a great Immorality, and hath many others evidently conſequent upon it, ſo that if by ſuch proceedings they make a Schiſm (the juſt Impu-

[a] Ἀτάκτως.

[b] Act. 20. 28. Tit. 1. 5.

[c] Can. Apoſt. 14. 35.

[d] Conc. Nic. Can. 6, 7, 8. Conc. Conſtantinop. Can. 2.

[e] Can. 13. 22.

[f] L. 14. & l. 36. C. de Epiſcopis & Clericis.

[g] Ἐπέκτασιν, &c. ſee Zonaras.

[h] Παρὰ τὴν γνώμην.

[i] Ἀλλὰ μετὰ ἐκχωρήσεως τὸ ἐγχωρεῖν ἐπισχόντα Balſamon in Can. 2. Conſtantinop.

[k] Ἄκλητος.

[l] Ἐν βαρβαρικοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

Imputation whereof I know not how they can avoid) then inſtead of bringing Men out of, they bring them into Immorality, and therefore by their Titles of *Meſſengers, Watchmen, &c.* they are obliged not to return.

It may be, 'twill be ſaid that theſe Dioceſes are their own, and that they come to recover their own Rights. But 1. If theſe were indeed their Rights, they cannot by thus returning hope to recover them, neither are they capable by the preſent Eſtabliſhment of having them, although the others ſhould be willing to reſign or deliver the Dioceſes up to them. 2. Where the fore-mentioned Cauſe is wanting or inſufficient, *viz.* that of ill Morals, this latter, of Right, by a true lover of Peace will be parted with of Courſe. *The good Shepherd giveth his life for the Sheep*, much more is he content to part with the profits of his Paſtoral Office to do them good. And as the true Mother of the Child, in the Caſe brought before *Solomon*, would rather ſuffer her Child to go to another Woman than John 10. 11.

then let it be divided: So will a true Paſtor, rather ſuffer his Flock to go to any other Orthodox Biſhop, than let it be crumbled and broken into Factions only for the ſake of him. The pretended Mother of that Child might have made her excuſe with the Schiſmaticks of our days, that ſhe had rather her Child ſhould be cut in pieces, than guilty of an Immorality in Honouring a falſe Mother, and witholding due Honour from the true One. And yet ſhe that had not that Scruple was the beſt Woman, and the true Mother of the Child as *Solomon* judged; and the Scripture approves his Judgment. And this would be ſuch another Immorality as the Authors of theſe late Books of Schiſm talk of in paying Allegiance to one whom Men might miſtake to be their King. But they wave the queſtion about the King's Title, as I ſaid before, and inſiſt on the invalidity of a *Lay-deprivation* the next thing to be conſidered; by way of anſwer to the ſecond Objection.

This

This Deprivation does not take away the Power conferr'd on them in Ordination, but only of having ſuch and ſuch Dioceſes or parts of the Kingdom to officiate in; which why the Supreme Civil Power, whether lodged in one or more Men, ſhould not be ſufficient to do, is altogether unintelligible. The diſtribution or diviſion of a Country into ſo many *Dioceſes* is not *Jure Divino*, but depends on the diſcretion and determination of the chief Governors of the Church, *i. e.* in a Chriſtian Country, of the Supreme Legiſlative Power; to the Preſervation whereof it is neceſſary to have them well marked out and fixed, and to the well-being of the Republick. Biſhops are Subjects, and Kings may demand Allegiance of them; and in caſe of refuſal, if they have the whole Legiſlative Power, they may forbid them living in any part of their Dominions. Such Power is neceſſarily annexed to, or rather implied in the Imperial Dignity; from which our bleſſed Saviour by his Goſpel detracted nothing, nor de-

signed to uphold his Disciples or Apostles against it; for his *Kingdom* was *not of this World.* And though the Church did subsist at first without the assistance of Heathen Emperors, yet Kings, when they embraced the true Faith, became Members of the Church as well as any other Believers, and are therefore as much obliged to act according to the Station wherein they are placed: As did the *Jewish* Kings notwithstanding that the Church, in *Egypt* and *Babylon*, did subsist without them; and as did the first and best of Christian Emperors; And among the rest of those Powers, that of depriving Bishops hath been one. And this Power hath been exercised here among us, with the Approbation of the Church of *England*, and consonantly to the Articles, Homilies and Canons thereof. And among the Reasons of Deprivation the not acknowledging the Kings Supremacy in Ecclesiastical Causes was none of the least; which yet is not so much as to deny his Civil Authority also, which is the present * Case. Indeed,

* See the Vindication of their Majesties Authority to fill the Sees, &c.

deed, if we conſider the Supreme Power only as having ſo much Authority as is abſolutely neceſſary to preſerve the Civil Government, and to ſecure the outward Peace of the Kingdom, we muſt own that it can judge alſo, what ſhall be reaſonable Security of any Subjects being true to the Government; and that Eccleſiaſtical Perſons as well as others, for want of ſuch Security given, may be deprived of places of truſt, or places where they may have conſiderable influence on the People, leaſt they ſhould pervert them to diſaffection. Hence follows a Power of removing Biſhops from their Sees upon ſuch occaſions; which that it belongs to the Sovereign, *Grotius* thinks is a very eaſy matter to prove. For he that hath power to baniſh a Man out of all parts of the Country or Kingdom, hath by * Conſequence a Power of forbidding him to exerciſe there the Epiſcopal Office. This he can do as the ſame *Grotius* obſerves, not only by way of Puniſhment, but alſo by way of Caution, if he finds the People tumultuous

Cujus rei facilis eſt probatio &c. Grotius *De Imperio Summar. Tot. circa Sacra, Cap.* 10. §. 33.

* *Hoc enim illi ineſt; ac cujus totum eſt in Poteſtate, ejus in Poteſtate pars non eſſe non poteſt.* Idem ibid.

on the account of any Paſtor, though without the Paſtor's fault.

And ſuch Deprivation may be made not only without, but even againſt the Conſent of a *Synod*; of whom Kings are ſo far from being obliged to ask the queſtion, whether they ſhall have their Subjects Allegiance or no; that they are rather obliged, eſpecially here in *England*, not to ask or enquire of them; becauſe it is a Violation of of the Laws of the Land, and an injury done to the proper Judges of Allegiance. And although in Caſes of Hereſy or Schiſm (when there are matters of difficulty to be decided) it is very fit and proper, and agreeable to the moſt ordinary and uſual practice of the Church to call *Synods*; Yet even in thoſe Caſes they are to be convened only at the Sovereign's * appointment, and when they are come together, they are all of them under the ſame Circumſtances of Obedience to the Civil Power, as they were ſingly before; obliged to the ſame Duties, and liable to the ſame Penalties

* Συνεχῶς δὲ καὶ τοὺς βασιλεῖς τῇ ἱστορίᾳ περιλαμβάνομεν, διότι ἀφ' οὗ Χριστανίζειν ἤρξαντο τὰ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας πράγματα ἤρτητο ἐξ αὐτῶν καὶ αἱ μέγισται σύνοδοι τῇ αὐτῶν γνώμῃ γεγόνασι τε καὶ γίνονται. Socr. Proœm. lib. 5. *Doce—quis Imperator hanc Synodum jusserit Congregari?* Hieron. Apolog. adv. Ruffinum lib. 2.

Penalties upon refuſal of them. How then can this be a matter of Eccleſiaſtical Cognizance, or how can it belong to them to determine it?

Examples of Emperors depoſing Biſhops without as well as with a *Synod* are many, and that even in the Caſe of *Hereſy*, which doth moſt properly belong to the determination of a *Synod*, and which they are beſt able to judge of; not but that in plain Caſes, or Caſes before ſufficiently declared Hereſy, this may be done without them, even as Kings in the Old-Teſtament, brake down the Images, deſtroyed the high Places, and put down the Idolatrous Prieſts by their own Authority; which Kings under the New-Teſtament having the entire Legiſlative Power, do not come ſhort of. Thus Chriſtian Emperors have depoſed Hereticks, and their Power to do ſo ſeems anciently to have been generally acknowledged on all hands. All Parties ſeem to have been ſenſible thereof. Sometimes the Emperor threatned to depoſe them, and ſome-

sometimes put it in Execution, without any ones gain-saying. To him Bishops brought their [a] Complaints against such other Bishops as they desired to have deposed; Him they sometimes [b] praised for using this Power; His Power they [c] acknowledged, though against themselves; In his Sentence, though sometimes unjust, they acquiesced [d]. And this is more than to depose them on the account of State-Crimes, or for default of Allegiance. Lastly; As this is agreeable to Antient Practise, so it is the constant and concurrent Sense of all the old Reformers, and till of late it hath been denyed, I think, by none but Papists, and some of the worst and maddest of Enthusiasts.

[a] Theodorit. lib. 5. c. 23.

[b] Leo. 1. Ep. 99.

[c] *Flavianus* in Theodor. loco citato.

[d] Socrat. lib. 2. c. 12.

And thus Men may become guilty of Schism by contending for Power. Whereby we may also discern, how Persons in other Relations, according as they happen to be concerned in some of these Circumstances, may become guilty of the same fault.

2. They

2. They may be Schiſmaticks by miſ-imploying their Power, and ſo cutting themſelves off from thoſe that are under them. For there is no Place ſo high as to make a Man incapable of this fault. Nor may Inferiors only be guilty of it in reſpect of their Superiors, or Superiors in reſpect of one another, but Superiors in reſpect of their Inferiors alſo. *The Head* may *ſay to the Feet, I have no need of you,* as well as the *Feet to the Head, we have no need of thee.* Wherefore the Supreme Civil Powers, if they ſhall ſet up and pull down Perſons at pleaſure, encouraging, increaſing, promoting Schiſmaticks, depoſing or highly diſcouraging thoſe that are Orthodox: Eccleſiaſtical Governors, Biſhops and Paſtors, if they ſhall do the like; if they ſhall refuſe to communicate with their Flock, unjuſtly excommunicate them, forbid them Communion in expreſs Terms, or by Conſequence exclude them by unjuſt Impoſitions and unreaſonable Terms of Communion, are guilty of Schiſm.

3*ly*. Men

3*ly*. Men are Schiſmaticks by diſobedience to Power, and that this may belong in ſome ſort to any Member of the Church, yea, or to any particular Church, hath been obſerved already; alſo that the Common People may have a ſhare in and partake of the guilt of Schiſm in moſt of the Caſes already mentioned, is not to be doubted; but I am taking notice only of what hath been as yet omitted, and comes neareſt to being peculiar to the Common People. And that is Diſobedience to their Lawful Governors in Spiritual Matters. Yet not all Diſobedience is Schiſmatical, (for then every Tranſgreſſor of Canons might be called a Schiſmatick) but ſuch as is *Cum Rebellione quadam*, as the * School-men expreſs it; when Men deſign thereby to ſignify openly deſert them, and *heap to themſelves Teachers after their own Luſts, having itching Ears*; when they diſown and diſclaim their Authority; when they preſume to invade the Biſhops, Prieſts or Deacons Office without being lawfully called, *climbing* into the *Sheepfold another way*, inſtead of *entring in at the Door*; when

Pag. 13.

* *Aquinas* 22. Q. 39. Art. 1. ad 2um.

2 Tim. 4. 3.

when they refuſe to Communicate on reaſonable Terms, or ſeparate themſelves becauſe they will not conform in Publick Aſſemblies to ~~your~~ Superiors Injunctions as to Ceremonies, *&c.* which laſt I ſee not how they can excuſe from Schiſm, except in two Caſes only. 1. That the Things commanded and appointed by them are unlawful in themſelves; in which Caſe, without all queſtion, it is their duty to diſobey them, and rather to ſeparate from them, than to comply and concur with them in that which is ſinful. Or 2*ly*. If they be not unlawful in their own Nature, but indifferent, as being no where forbidden; yet if they are unlawful in reſpect of ſome Circumſtances, as if they ſhould be ſo many and ſo extremely inconvenient, as to hinder Men in their chief deſign of Worſhipping God in their Aſſemblies, and Men have no other way of getting themſelves relieved. But this, ſome Improprieties of Speech, or inſignificant Ceremonies, if not too many and frequent, can never hinder. Yea, a few of them need not take off the leaſt de-

gree of Devotion in Men of Charity or Underſtanding.

Moreover if ſuch excuſes as theſe, *viz.* having better words, more ſignificant Ceremonies, or none at all, were of any value, they never would be wanting, nor would there be a poſſibility of keeping Order, Unity, or Peace in any Church whatſoever. Our bleſſed Saviour, beſide his Precepts of Love and Charity, hath provided no means to prevent ſuch Cavels as theſe are, neither is it poſſible. Mens Fancies never did, never can agree in all theſe Particulars; nor can any one perhaps at all times agree with himſelf. And therefore I ſhall not here ſpend any more time upon them.

From what hath been ſaid, it appears, that there are ways, and thoſe more perhaps than I have yet enumerated or can reckon up, whereby Men may become guilty of Schiſm in all Eſtates and Conditions. Whence it is not without cauſe that the Fathers, when they are ſpeaking about Schiſm, do repreſent it ſo

ſo * variouſly, ſometimes as a Separation from the Biſhop, ſometimes from the Prieſts, ſometimes from the Deacons, and ſometimes from the common People; as doth S. *Cyprian* himſelf. Whence we may ſee how little weight there is in that Saying commonly quoted out of his 66. Epiſt. *Scire debes Epiſcopum in Eccleſia eſſe & Eccleſiam in Epiſcopo, & ſi qui cum Epiſcopo non ſint in Eccleſia non eſſe*; as to the uſes which have been lately made of it.

And in all the fore-mentioned Caſes, the Schiſm proceeds from one or more Members, not having a due care and concern for the reſt, or from not having an equal Care according to their reſpective States and Conditions. And therefore the Apoſtle in the place before quoted, 1 *Cor.* 12. 25. doth intimate that there would be *no Schiſm in the Body*, if all the Members did take *the ſame care one for another.*

* Τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ προσέχεσθε, καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ καὶ διακόνοις. S. Ignatii Epiſt. ad Philadelph. c. 7. It is called σχοπάζειν πρὸς τὸν πρεσβυτέρους. Clement. Ep. ad Corinth. 1. cap. 47.

Epiſcopatum autem tenere non poſſet etiamſi Epiſcopus prius factus, a Coepiſcoporum ſuorum corpore & ab Eccleſiæ unitate deſciſceret. Cypr. Ep. 55. *Qui ſe ab Eccleſiæ vinculo atq; a Sacerdotum Collegio ſeparat Epiſcopi nec poteſtatem poteſt habere, nec honorem,* Id. ibid.

An eſſe ſibi cum Chriſto videtur qui adverſus Sacerdotes Chriſti facit? qui ſe a Cleri ejus & plebis Societate diſcernit. Id. De unitat. Eccleſiæ Ed. Oxon. p. 116.

—*Plebs obſequens præceptis Dominicis, & Deum metuens, a peccatore præpoſito ſeparare ſe debet, nec ſe ad Sacrilegi Sacerdotis ſacrificia miſcere, &c.* Id. Ep. 67. Ed. Oxon.

Laſtly, We may obſerve, that every particular Schiſm is an injury to and a Schiſm in reſpect of the whole Church; as every diviſion of any one Member of the Body is by conſequence againſt the whole Body; which is not ſound, compleat, and intire, except it be ſo in every particular Member of it, or if but one of the Members is broken. Therefore, as our Saviour ſays concerning the doing or denying
Mat.25.40,45 any charitable Act, *Inſomuch as you did, or did it not to one of the leaſt of theſe, you did or did it not unto me*: So we may ſay, where a Schiſm is made in any particular Church; In as much as you have made a Diviſion in this particular Church, you have ſeparated your ſelves from Chriſt the Head, and made a Rent in the whole Body.

But perhaps Men would not be ſo apt of themſelves, or ſo eaſily prevailed upon by others to Separate themſelves from their Brethren, did they duly conſider, how great a Crime, of how ill and dangerous conſequence to the Church in general, to themſelves and others, this of Schiſm is, which therefore I ſhall take ſome Conſideration of;

of; and it is the ſecond thing I propoſed to ſpeak to: Wherein I do not deſign to make Reflections on any one Party more than another, but only to conſider the nature of this Sin indifferently to whomſoever it may belong.

St. *Paul*, who, as I obſerved before, uſeth Hereſy and Schiſm promiſcuouſly, as did alſo the Primitive Chriſtians for ſome time after him, reckons it among the *works of the Fleſh*. Whereby he ſignifies that it is not commonly on a bare Miſtake, or Miſapprehenſion of Things, nor out of Zeal for Religion; but upon ſome worldly Deſigns and Intereſts, that Men do become guilty of it. But whatever the Deſign may be, a very dangerous and pernicious thing it is. Gal. 5. 20. 1 Cor. 3. 3, 4.

Unity is the Strength of all Societies, Diviſion the Weakneſs and Infirmity of them. There is no readier way to deſtroy a Church then to divide it. *Every Kingdom divided againſt it ſelf is brought to Deſolation, and a Houſe divided againſt a Houſe falleth.* Wherefore Schiſm lays the *Axe to the root* of that Church wherein it is bred, and

and tends to the utter Ruin and Subverſion, firſt of it; next, if it be in a Proteſtant Church, of the Proteſtant Religion, which it hereby lays open to powerful Adverſaries; and laſt of all of Chriſtianity it ſelf. Every particular Schiſm in ſome ſort reacheth the Univerſal Church, as I have already ſhewn. So it is againſt the Goſpel and againſt Chriſt; and is therefore *Crimen læſæ Majeſtatis Divinæ*, as ſome do ſtile it.

Vide Gregor. Tholoſ. Syntag. jur. Univerſi, lib. 33. cap. 11. §. 1.

It is againſt the deſign of our Saviour's coming into the World; who came *to make Peace*, not only between God and Man, but alſo amongſt Men. He gave the ſtricteſt Commands about it; He contrived the firmeſt Bands to maintain it. Schiſm violates theſe Precepts, fruſtrates this Deſign, breaketh theſe Bands, makes our Saviour's Paſſion vain, and the Croſs of Chriſt to be of none effect. It makes the Evangelical Writings vain; for the Goſpel was written to that intent which the Schiſmatick diſappointeth. St. *John* ſays, *That which we have heard and ſeen declare we unto you that ye, may have fellow-*

1 John 1. 3.

ſhip

ſhip with us, and truly our Fellowſhip is with the Father and with his Son Jeſus Chriſt. A good Shepherd gathers the Sheep together; the Schiſmatick makes it his buſineſs to ſcatter them.

It gives Scandal to thoſe that are without. The Diviſions of Chriſtians in general do give offence unto the *Jews* and *Pagans* and make the *name of God Blaſphem'd among the Gentiles*, and the Diviſions among Proteſtants do make our Reformation Blaſphemed amongſt the Papiſts. It cauſeth Atheiſm and Infidelity, when each part ſays there is no Salvation to be had in the contrary Part; diſſolute Perſons perſwade themſelves that there is none in either. And while ſome Men are crying, *Lo here is Chriſt*, and others, *Lo he is there*, ſuch as might otherwiſe have a Mind to enter into the Church know not whither to come.

It makes all Virtues in general not to thrive ſo well, in that Church where there are Diviſions; it diſturbeth that *Joy* and *Peace* which are the *Fruites of the* Holy *Spirit* of God; it takes off much from that comfort in Chriſt, which ſhould be the lot of every Pious and devout Chriſtian.

ſtian. Whence there is not only great Vehemence of Paſſion, but admirable ſoundneſs of Reaſon in that earneſt Exhortation of the Apoſtle to Unity, *If there be any Conſolation in Chriſt, if any comfort of Love, if any fellowſhip of the Spirit, if any Bowels and Mercies; fulfil ye my Joy, that ye be like minded, having the ſame Love, being of one Accord, of one Mind.* Whence ★ ſome have called it *Sacrilege*, not only becauſe it is a Violation of Divine Ordinances and Uſurpation of Sacred Offices, but becauſe it ſeems to be far greater robbery to deprive the Church of the benefit of all theſe things, then to take the Silver or Gold out of the Temple.

Phil. 2. 1, 2.

* St. *Auguſtine* and S. *Cyprian* in divers places.

It ſhews want of Charity or Love, as of God ſo alſo of our Brethren, on ſuch eaſy terms to divide our ſelves from them; too hardly to Judge them; too highly to Eſteem our ſelves; too little to bear with them; to be too ready to grieve them; not to have compaſſion on their Neceſſities and Wants in Spiritual matters; not to be willing to give them our aſſiſtance as Members of the ſame Body ſhould do

to

to one another. Wherefore the Apoſtle after having Deſcribed the Nature of Schiſm in the Firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, Chap. 12. ſpends one whole Chapter more in praiſe of Charity; and ſetting forth its Adjuncts and Properties, doth touch upon thoſe things which ſeem in the Schiſmatick to be more eſpecially wanting. *Charity ſuffereth long and is kind; Charity envieth not; Charity vaunteth not it ſelf, is not puffed up, doth not behave it ſelf unſeemly, ſeeketh not her own, is not eaſily provoked, thinketh no Evil, rejoyceth not in Iniquity, but rejoyceth in the Truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things.* 1 Cor. 13. v. 4, 5, 6, 7.

But the Schiſmatick is not only Uncharitable, and thereby injurious to his Neighbour, but bringeth many and great Inconveniences upon himſelf, by cutting himſelf off from the Church of God, whence he is *Condemned of himſelf*, as the Apoſtle ſpeaketh, and *Separating themſelves they have not the Spirit*, ſaith St. *Jude*. They have not the kind Influences of the Holy Spirit, whereby the Jude. v. 19.

Church is governed. Whence not only all their Gifts, but all their good works are utterly ſpoiled and come to nothing. As a Part cannot retain its Senſe and Life when it is cut off from the Body, as the Branch cannot bear Fruit except it *abide in the Vine*; as a Rivulet is ſoon dried up when ſeparated from the Fountain; as a Ray cannot ſubſiſt when taken away from the Sun: So neither can a Schiſmatick Reap any profit from his gifts or good works, when Separated from the reſt of the Church of Chriſt.

John. 15. 4.

St. Cyprian. *de unitate Eccleſiæ.*

The Apoſtle ſpeaketh as to both of them in the beginning of the forementioned Chapter, concerning Gifts; *Though I ſpeak with the Tongues of Men and Angels, though I have the gift of Propheſy and underſtand all Myſteries and all Knowledge, and though I have Faith ſo that I could remove Mountains, and have not Charity, I am nothing.* Again, concerning good Works; *Though I beſtow all my Goods to feed the Poor, and though I give my Body to be Burned, and have not Charity, it profiteth me nothing.*

Some

Some are not ſenſible that it is any great harm to go amongſt them, to pray with them, or to hear the Goſpel Preached. But to joyn with them, in thoſe otherwiſe Holy Offices, is the way to become partakers of their Sins. *Their Sacrifices ſhall be unto them as the Bread of Mourning, all that eat thereof ſhall be Polluted.* Hoſ. 9. 4. *Where two or three indeed are gathered together in* Chriſt's *Name,* there is He *in the midſt of them*; but not when they are gathered againſt his Name, and againſt the other Members of the Church. Such Mens Prayers are not only Ineffectual, but Execrable. The Communion of Chriſt is but one. Among his Diſciples there is *Peace.* We muſt not Communicate with thoſe who break that Peace, leaſt we become *partakers of their evil Deeds,* and make the Breach wider by Encouraging of them. They are without the Church; and we muſt not be with them. For we cannot be within and without at the ſame time. *He that is not with me is againſt me, and he that Gathereth* Mat. 18. 20. Mat. 12. 30.

not with me Scattereth, ſaith our Saviour. Their Prayers and Preaching, and other parts of Divine Worſhip being performed in Oppoſition to the other Members of the Church, are turned into Sin; and
1 Cor. 11. 17. they *come together*, as did the *Corinthians* in a Diviſion of theirs, *not for the better but for the worſe.*

Thus we ſee how Schiſm is a work of the Fleſh againſt Chriſt's Kingdom, againſt the Goſpel, againſt the Proteſtant Religion, againſt Virtue in general, againſt all the Apoſtolical Rules of Charity, very pernicious to the Church, very hurtful to the Schiſmatick himſelf, and of dangerous Conſequence to all that go after him.

All things therefore are to be endured before we make a Schiſm, even Immoralities themſelves, where we are not made to concur with them, when it doth not belong to our Office to Reform them, when it doth not lye in our Power to Reform them without breaking in upon other Mens Rights, and doing Immoral Actions our ſelves. And then cer-

certainly we are much more obliged to lay aſide private Advantages, *not to ſeek our own*, to let fall particular Quarrels for the ſake of the Church of Chriſt. And if our Governours ſhould deal hardly by us, and require difficult things of us in Divine Worſhip, not fruſtrating the main end of the Worſhip it ſelf; if ſome Words are improper, if ſome Ceremonies are uncouth, yet not hindring us from ſerving God *with a pure Heart*, we ought to bear with them. *Charity beareth all things.* It is a large Expreſſion, taking in all things that are tolerable. Surely theſe indifferent things. And in a latter Schiſm here among us, Men ſeem to be hard put to it to find a Cauſe of Separation, when Proteſtants are forced to take up old Confuted Popery to ground it upon. If they had never ſo juſt a State-quarrel on the account of a Popiſh Prince, one would think they ſhould ſcarcely part with the Principles of their own Religion for the ſake of him. To conclude then with the Apoſtles Words, *Let us walk by the ſame Rule, let us mind* Phil. 3. 16.

the

Rom. 14. 19. *the same thing; Let us follow after*
things which make for Peace, and
Eph. 4. 2, 3. *wherewith one may Edifie another; With*
Lowliness and Meekness, with long Suffering
forbearing one another in Love; Endeavouring
to keep the Unity of the Spirit in the Bond
Peace; And let us Mark them which
Rom. 16. 17. *Divisions and Offences contrary to the Doctrine*
which We have Learned, and avoid them.

FINIS.